

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE  
ON DISARMAMENT

PRIVATE

ENDC/PV.11  
29 March 1962

ENGLISH

THE UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

FEB 6 1963

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING DOCUMENT  
COLLECTION

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Thursday, 29 March 1962, at 10 a.m.

Chairman:

Mrs. MYRDAL

(Sweden)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. de MELLO-FRANCO  
Mr. RODRIGUES RIBAS  
Mr. de ARAUJO CASTRO  
Mr. ASSUNCAO de ARAUJO

Bulgaria:

Mr. C. LOUCANOV  
Mr. M. TARABANOV  
Mr. V. PALINE  
Mr. N. MINTCHEV

Burma:

Mr. J. BARRINGTON  
U Tin MAUNG  
U Aye LWIN

Canada:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS  
Mr. J.E.G. HARDY  
Mr. R. TAIT  
Mr. J.F.M. BELL

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. J. HAJEK  
Mr. E. PEPICH  
Mr. M. ZEMLA  
Mr. V. VAJNAR

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. GEBRE-EGZY  
Mr. M. HAMID  
Mr. A. MANDEFRO

India:

Mr. M.J. DESAI  
Mr. A.S. LALL  
Mr. A.S. MEHTA  
Mr. C.K. GAIROLA

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

Italy:

Mr. C. RUSSO  
Mr. F. CAVALLETTI  
Mr. A. CAGIATI  
Mr. C. COSTA-REGHINI

Mexico:

Mr. L. PADILLA NERVO  
Mr. E. CALDERON PUIG  
Miss E. AGUIRRE  
Mr. A. ICAZA

Nigeria:

Mr. A.A. ATTA

Poland:

Mr. M. NASZKOWSKI  
Mr. M. BIEN  
Mr. T. WISNIEWSKI  
Mr. W. WIECZOREK

Romania:

Mr. G. MACOVESCU  
Mr. M. MALITZA  
Mr. C. SANDRU  
Mr. E. GLASER

Sweden:

Mrs. A. MYRDAL  
Mr. R. EDBERG  
Baron C.H. von PLATEN  
Mr. M. STAHL

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Mr. V.A. ZORIN  
Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN  
Mr. I.G. USACHEV  
Mr. V.N. ZHEREBTSOV

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

United Arab Republic:

Mr. A.F. HASSAN  
Mr. A. El-ERIAN  
Mr. M.S. AHMED  
Mr. S. ABDEL-HAMID

United Kingdom:

Mr. J.B. GODBER  
Sir Michael WRIGHT  
Mr. J.S.H. SHATTOCK  
Mr. J.H. LAMBERT

United States of America:

Mr. A. DEAN  
Mr. C.C. STELLE,  
Mr. R.I. SPIERS  
Mr. T.R. PICKERING

Special Representative of the  
Secretary-General:

Mr. O. LOUTFI

Deputy to the Special Representative  
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (Sweden): The eleventh meeting of the Conference is called to order.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): We should like today to continue our Committee's work in pursuit of the primary objective which has been assigned to it and on which we have already held some discussions, namely, the elaboration of a treaty on general and complete disarmament.

At our last meeting, you will remember, there was an exchange of views on the preamble of the draft treaty, which is a quite important part of the whole document, and certain views were expressed, in particular, by the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, whose remarks we have carefully studied.

We find we can fully accept the suggestions made by Mr. Rusk at our last meeting and we are prepared to add to the text of the preamble the two provisions he suggested from the Agreed Principles for general and complete disarmament previously accepted by the governments of the United States and of the Soviet Union and approved by the General Assembly (ENDC/5). The two additions suggested by Mr. Rusk will appear as follows in our preamble. After the paragraph reading:

"Conscious of the need to build relations among States on the basis of the principles of peace, good-neighbourliness, equality of States and peoples, non-interference, and respect for the independence and sovereignty of all countries," (ENDC/2)

the following passage from the Agreed Principles will be inserted:

"(Recognizing that) it is important that all States abide by existing international agreements, refrain from any actions which might aggravate international tensions, and that they seek settlement of all disputes by peaceful means," (ENDC/5)

This is the passage which Mr. Rusk mentioned and which we consider it completely appropriate to include in the preamble of the treaty.

It will be followed by the next paragraph already included in our draft:

"Reaffirming their dedication to the aims and principles of the United Nations Charter," (ENDC/2)

We then propose to insert the second paragraph in the Agreed Principles mentioned by Mr. Rusk, which would read as follows:

"(Envisaging that general and complete) disarmament (will be) accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter," (ENDC/5)

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

The text will then continue as follows according to our draft:

"Have resolved to conclude the present Treaty, and to implement forthwith general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control." (ENDC/2)

Thus the two suggestions made by Mr. Rusk have been fully taken into account and have been incorporated in the draft preamble.

I think Mr. Stelle will not object if I also state that, in our capacity as Co-Chairmen, we had a preliminary talk on this subject today, and I understand that the United States delegation has some further ideas about the preamble which it will place before us at this meeting.

But we think it would be advisable to try and finish our discussion of the preamble today. If delegations have no other suggestions, perhaps we could conclude today what is customarily termed the first reading of the draft preamble. Since the main ideas that have been expressed have been co-ordinated and taken into account, we believe that it is possible to do so.

We attach great importance to making sufficiently active progress with the elaboration of a draft treaty and to reaching agreement on those matters on which agreement can be reached as quickly as possible and with no unnecessary delay. To our way of thinking, this is of great moral and political significance in the present situation.

The whole world is now following the work of our Committee, and it is most desirable that the work that has begun should result in definite and specific advances.

We consider that agreement on the preamble would be the first such practical advance towards the achievement of the primary objective on which we have all agreed. That is why I hope that our discussion today will enable us to conclude this stage of our work and that, with the assistance of all delegations which may wish to put forward additional ideas, we can complete an agreed text of the preamble.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I would like to address myself this morning to two matters referred to by Secretary Rusk at our last plenary meeting, on Tuesday, 27 March. They are, first, the matter of the preamble to the Soviet draft treaty of 15 March and, secondly, the first of the four broad substantive areas of a programme of general and complete disarmament to which the United States has suggested that the plenary Conference address itself in carrying out United Nations resolution 1722 (XVI) of 20 December 1961.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

In his statement here on Tuesday Secretary Rusk proposed that the various delegations study the draft preamble submitted by the Soviet Union and submit their suggestions to the Secretariat. I would like to reaffirm that proposal and to suggest that we set a definite time -- perhaps 10.00 a.m. on Tuesday, 3 April -- by which these comments should be submitted. My own delegation will hand in specific drafting suggestions to the Secretariat by that time. In the meantime, I should like to discuss some of the suggestions in terms of principle which I hope will be incorporated in specific language. I want to propose that either the co-Chairmen or a drafting sub-committee appointed by this Conference -- either form would be acceptable to us -- should seek agreement on a draft on the basis of these comments for submission to the plenary Conference.

We are very grateful to the representative of the Soviet Union for the statement he has made this morning and for his acceptance of the two points which Secretary Rusk made by way of illustration in his statement. Nevertheless, we believe that the drafting of this preamble is a very important matter for the plenary Conference. We believe too, as I will set out in more detail in my statement this morning, that there are a number of other matters which ought to be considered, and that each of the delegations should be given the opportunity to get their comments in to the Secretariat by next Tuesday.

Before commenting in detail on the preamble, I should like to clarify my delegation's concept of the nature and purpose of the preamble we are considering.

Both the Soviet treaty outline of 15 March (ENDC/2) and the United States programme (ENDC/6) of 25 September -- the two proposals the Conference has agreed to consider in the light of the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles (ENDC/5) of 20 September 1961 -- contain preambles. We believe that the treaty outline or agreed programme which emerges from this Conference and which we hope to submit to the United Nations Disarmament Commission by 1 June of this year should contain such a preamble. We would hope that if it met with general approval it could form part of the treaty, which we would elaborate in a form suitable for actual ratification and implementation by our respective Governments.

This preamble to which we are addressing ourselves is therefore a truly important document, a document comparable in importance to the Preamble to the United Nations Charter and thus worthy of comparable effort and attention as regards both its substance and its style, which will be important in connexion with its general acceptance. So we do not take lightly this task of drafting the preamble; we expect to proceed responsibly in its formulation.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

Permit me to thank the representative of the Soviet Union again for his adoption of the two ideas Secretary Rusk put forward by way of illustration. My Soviet colleague has already read those two parts of the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles and therefore I shall not re-read them.

A further thought is expressed in the preamble to the United States plan of 25 September 1961 -- namely, that the States of the world are determined to create conditions in which all the peoples can strive freely and peacefully to fulfil their basic aspirations. I underline here the words "freely and peacefully" to emphasize the nature and character of the environment in which man seeks to live and which should be stated in any preamble describing the world as the nations would like to see it.

There is also another idea stated in the preamble to the United States plan -- that the goal for which we are striving is a free, secure and peaceful world of independent States which adhere to common standards of justice and international conduct, in which there shall be permanent general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The central thought here is that general and complete disarmament is not in itself the goal, nor will it alone, by itself and in itself, bring a free, secure and peaceful world.

As stated above, general and complete disarmament must be accompanied by the progressive strengthening of the United Nations peace-keeping arrangements. We must give very careful study to the question of how the United Nations peace-keeping arrangements are to be strengthened.

There is the idea that man does not live by bread alone, that there is more to life than material values and progress, and that therefore a reference should be inserted, similar to that in the United States preamble, to man's cultural and spiritual ideals and hope for progress. It may be that the drafters of the Soviet preamble intend that the words "welfare" and "socio-economic" -- I pause to confess that I myself do not quite know what the word "socio-economic" means -- include the words "cultural and spiritual", but we for our part would like to see this made more explicit.

Important as the preamble is -- and we do not by any manner of means underestimate its importance in the document because of its general acceptance throughout the world -- we should not, in the view of the United States delegation, delay the discussion of the real business of general and complete disarmament while the preamble is being developed.



(Mr. Dean, United States)

Mr. Rusk, the United States Secretary of State, in his statement before this Conference on Tuesday last, proposed a constructive manner of approaching this task. It is one which defines specific groups of related measures for discussion. Four areas are defined in terms of an agreed document, the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles of 20 September last. Four areas are common to both the plans that have been submitted to this Conference. They are narrow enough to concentrate our discussion on real issues and specific measures. They are broad enough to permit discussion of fundamental approaches as well as the precise texts in which they are embodied. They do not place either side in a position which permits it to discuss only its own document or proposal. They do not place either side in the position of addressing itself only to a document presented by another delegation. They are fair and balanced groupings designed to encourage fair and balanced discussion. Let me outline them. They are:

First, measures for the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, as indicated in paragraph 3 (b) of the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles of 20 September 1961.

Second, measures for the elimination of all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction, including orbiting vehicles, and for the reduction and elimination of all armed forces, conventional armaments, military expenditures, military training and military establishments, as indicated in paragraphs 3(a), (c) and (e) of the Agreed Principles.

Third, measures for the creation of an international disarmament organization within the framework of the United Nations and for effective verification of the disarmament programme, as indicated in paragraph 6 of the Agreed Principles.

Fourth, measures to strengthen institutions for the maintenance of peace and settlement of international disputes by peaceful means, including the establishment of a United Nations peace force, as indicated in paragraphs 1(b), 2 and 7 of the Agreed Principles.

I would like to turn today to the first of these four broad areas of general and complete disarmament to which the United States has suggested the plenary Conference address itself, and explain very briefly how the United States views these measures referred to in paragraph 3(b) of the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles. Paragraph 3(b) states:

"To this end, the programme for general and complete disarmament shall contain the necessary provisions, with respect to the military establishment of every nation, for:

(Mr. Dean, United States)

(b) Elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological, and other weapons of mass destruction and cessation of the production of such weapons." (ENDC/5, page 2)

In the United States plan such measures include those listed in stage I B(d) on CBR weapons; stage I C (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) on measures to contain and reduce the nuclear threat; stage II B(e) on halting the production of and reducing CBR weapons; stage II C on further reductions of nuclear weapons; and stage III (a) and (c) on the elimination of all weapons except those required for maintaining internal order and for the United Nations peace force.

The guiding principles underlying the United States plan are those which have been stated in the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles of 20 September 1961 as agreed to by both the USSR and the United States, and endorsed by the United Nations. They state, first -- and I quote from the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles -- that "all measures of general and complete disarmament should be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty could any State or group of States gain military advantage and that security is ensured equally for all"; second, that "all disarmament measures should be implemented from beginning to end under such strict and effective international control as would provide firm assurance that all parties are honouring their obligations"; and third, that "progress in disarmament should be accompanied by measures to strengthen institutions for maintaining peace and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means" (ENDC/5, pages 2 and 3).

In accordance with these guiding and agreed principles, stage I nuclear weapons measures in the United States plan aim first at a complete and immediate stop to the spread of a nuclear weapons capability to nations not now having such capability. Today four nations have a nuclear weapons capability. Who knows, tomorrow it may be more, and the next day more and more? Who knows where it will stop? United Nations resolutions and many other international conference resolutions adopted by unanimous vote have urged that the spread of nuclear weapons capabilities be halted.

On the other hand, the Soviet plan and treaty do not provide in stage I for as effective an immediate stop to the spread of nuclear weapons capabilities, for the simple reason that in the Soviet plan for stage I nuclear measures are inseparably linked to all other measures in their draft treaty, whereas in the United States plan for stage I nuclear measures could be put into effect immediately. This is a very important distinction between the United States plan

(Mr. Dean, United States)

and the Soviet plan. It should also be noted that not until stage II does the Soviet draft treaty provide that all States should stop production of fissionable materials for weapon purposes. I would like to ask our Soviet colleagues why their treaty is so drafted as not to provide that measures for stopping the production of fissionable materials for weapon purposes should be included in stage I.

Secondly, the stage I nuclear measures of the United States plan, as indicated by Secretary Rusk, provide for the immediate reduction of stocks of weapon-grade fissionable materials by an initial transfer of 50,000 kilograms from nuclear weapon stocks to peaceful purposes. This amount, when combined with other materials which are used in fabricating nuclear weapons, would produce warheads of tens of thousands of megatons of explosive power -- or it could be used for peaceful purposes, in the production of an enormous amount of kilowatts of electrical energy. The Soviet draft treaty, on the other hand, does not provide in stage I for any reduction at all in nuclear stockpiles. If the figures that we have put forward are not acceptable to the Soviet Union we will be very happy to receive suggestions from our Soviet colleagues as to what figures would be appropriate. Indeed, the Soviet treaty permits in stage I unlimited and unrestricted production by nuclear Powers of fissionable materials for weapon purposes, and thereby permits the continuing build-up rather than the reduction, of nuclear weapon stockpiles. Again I would like to ask my Soviet colleagues why they believe that no measures for the reduction of nuclear stockpiles should be included in stage I, such measures as are included in the United States plan.

Thirdly, the stage I nuclear measures of the United States plan provide, as does indeed the Soviet plan of 23 September 1960 (A/4505), for joint studies by a nuclear experts commission within the international disarmament organization on the feasibility and the means of accomplishing the verified reduction and elimination of remaining nuclear weapon stockpiles. The Soviet Union, the United States and other nations, since at least as far back as the year 1955, have been confronted by the problem of devising means by which the elimination of nuclear weapons could in effect be verified. It is for this reason that both the United States and Soviet plans have proposed that joint studies by nuclear experts be undertaken in stage I. Until such studies have explored and produced a solution to this problem the United States, consistent with the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles concerning effective verification and balanced security, cannot conclude an agreement unconditionally providing for the elimination of nuclear weapons;

(Mr. Dean, United States)

nor, do we believe, can any other nation. Even though our good friends of the Soviet Union admit that this is the case and therefore, like the United States, provided in their plan of 23 September 1960 for expert study of this problem in stage I, they have, nevertheless, without the results of such a study, put forward in stage II what amounts, as we understand their statements to a proposal for an unverified elimination of nuclear weapons -- and this is contrary to the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles. Perhaps we are in error on this; if we are, we will be very happy to be enlightened.

It should be noted, however, that the Soviet draft treaty of 15 March no longer provides for stage I studies on the elimination of nuclear weapons. We ask this question of our Soviet colleagues: has the Soviet Union discovered, since its plan of 23 September 1960, a means of verifying the elimination of nuclear weapons? If so we would be very happy to have them come forward with the results of such studies and we would be very happy indeed to examine those studies. If they have not discovered such a means, then we at least believe that it is open to question -- and I say this subject to being enlightened on the matter -- whether we have an adequate basis at this time for putting forward a proposal in stage II for the verified elimination of nuclear weapons. And I raise the question whether there should not be re-inserted in the draft treaty submitted by the Soviet Union the previous Soviet proposal of 23 September 1960 for joint studies on this question.

I would also like to ask our Soviet colleagues whether the Soviet Union has given up, in stage I of its disarmament programme, the idea of joint studies relating to the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, or whether it stands by the provision for joint studies contained in stage I of its plan of 23 September 1960.

In accordance with the United States plan, by the end of stage I the spread of nuclear weapons capabilities would be halted; nuclear stockpiles would be significantly reduced; a nuclear experts commission would have made its first findings on the feasibility of a verified elimination of nuclear weapons; and all fissionable materials for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy transferred between countries would be subject to appropriate safeguards, developed in agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna.

In stage II of the United States plan, stocks of nuclear weapons would be further reduced by agreed amounts or to agreed levels, depending upon the findings of the nuclear experts commission. Until the nuclear experts devised means for safely controlling the reduction and elimination of nuclear stockpiles no nation

(Mr. Dean, United States)

would, consistent with the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles, permit the reduction of its own stockpiles to lower levels -- to say nothing of the complete elimination of the nuclear weapons in its stockpiles. I say this because it is apparent that this action would violate both the principle of verified reduction and the other important principle of balanced disarmament, ensuring equal security for all. It is for this reason that the United States believes that its stage II nuclear measures are more realistic and sound than the Soviet stage II nuclear measures. But, again, this is a subject which we will wish to discuss in detail.

In stage III, consistent with an effective verification system, the United States proposes that all nuclear weapons of national forces be eliminated.

There is one problem which will have to be discussed at the appropriate time, and that is the kinds of weapons with which the United Nations peace force shall be armed. That is a very important question on which we shall probably wish to spend a considerable time; that is, when all national forces and all their national weapons have been eliminated, with the exception of those for peaceful uses inside their own communities, we shall have to consider with what weapons the United Nations peace force will be armed.

Finally, what is true of the United States and Soviet nuclear measures is also true of the United States and Soviet proposals for the reduction and elimination of chemical, biological and other weapons of mass destruction. In the United States plan, as in the Soviet plan of 23 September 1960, stage I provides for joint expert studies on the feasibility of and means for the verified reduction and elimination of such weapons. However, as is the case with nuclear weapons, the United States plan in stage II makes reduction and the stopping of production dependent on the results of the studies, whereas the Soviet draft -- again, I submit, contrary to the Joint Statement on Agreed Principles -- seems to propose the unverifiable elimination of chemical, biological and radiological weapons. If I am wrong on this, I would be very happy to receive clarification.

As in the case of nuclear weapons, the proposed Soviet treaty drops from stage I any reference to joint studies of CBR weapons. Again, if our Soviet colleagues have now devised means whereby the reduction and elimination of CBR weapons can be verified, I very much hope they will submit information on such means in order that we may all examine it.

In conclusion, let me say a few more-hopeful words about the possible areas of agreement in this field of general and complete disarmament concerned with the reduction and elimination of weapons of mass destruction.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

With a return by our Soviet colleagues to their position prior to 1961, when they had endorsed the report of the Geneva experts, of which their scientists approved (EXP/NUC/28), a treaty banning all nuclear tests in all environments could probably be agreed upon here and now, either as a separate measure or as part of some broader agreement. There could also be an agreement on the non-transfer of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear Powers. There should, I submit, be no difficulty in agreeing to the transfer of agreed amounts of fissionable materials for peaceful uses under appropriate safeguards developed in agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency. There should be no difficulty in agreeing to the setting up of nuclear and CBR expert study groups on the feasibility of means for accomplishing the verified reduction and elimination of nuclear and CBR weapons.

Finally, while the Soviet Union has refrained from proposing in stage I of its draft treaty the halting of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes and also a reduction in nuclear stockpiles, the United States is very hopeful that our Soviet colleagues will be willing to negotiate on these measures also.

In order to make good progress in these areas, the United States and other countries have proposed the early establishment of sub-committees of both the plenary Committee and the Committee of the Whole. Let me assure the Conference that we suggest this only so that we can proceed with the work of the Conference in an orderly way. It is not designed to avoid getting on with our main work, that of drafting a treaty on general and complete disarmament that we can all accept. We are agreeable to consider any businesslike procedures for getting on with the work of the Conference. The United States is also hopeful that our Soviet colleagues will agree to such a method so that we can proceed to early agreement on and implementation of these measures that will facilitate the programme of general and complete disarmament, that will form part of a programme of general and complete disarmament, and that can and should be undertaken immediately.

We put this forward, I can assure you, only in a helpful and constructive spirit, and we are prepared to discuss any other suggestions, since we have no fixed idea as to how the work of the Conference should proceed. We would be very happy to hear any other suggestions for any better ways or means of organizing the work of this Conference. We have put this forward perhaps in too much detail, but we have done so in the hope that at this early stage of our Conference it might help in achieving progress in our work.

Mr. BURNS (Canada): The delegation of Canada would like to say a few words in regard to how we think the Conference should deal with the preamble to the treaty which we hope to produce here. We have before us, as material from which the preamble can be produced, firstly, the preamble to the Soviet Union's draft treaty on general and complete disarmament, and, secondly, the preamble to the United States programme for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world.

The Canadian delegation notes that there are elements common to these two documents, or, perhaps we should say, to these sections of documents, which clearly should be contained in whatever preamble we eventually agree upon. However, my delegation has to state that neither preamble as now drafted seems entirely satisfactory for the purposes which we have in mind. I propose, not to offer criticisms or specific amendments, but rather to suggest how we should go about the drafting of this very important section of what is to be a very important document.

As previous speakers have pointed out, the preamble to a treaty on general and complete disarmament will have great significance. Its content should be most carefully considered and its language should be precise and dignified, one might almost say solemn, for in this preamble will be set forth the motives, the intentions and the hopes of all parties to the disarmament agreement, which we all intend to be a landmark in human history.

Thus, in the opinion of my delegation, the drafting of the preamble is not a task which can be accomplished during a few hours' discussion in this Committee, even in a discussion assisted by texts which have been drafted by various members of the Committee.

At the same time, the Canadian delegation wishes to see solid progress in arriving at an understanding as to the basic ideas which should be included in the preamble. We consider that there are two main sources from which such ideas should be drawn: first, the Charter of the United Nations, and secondly, the joint statement of basic principles of disarmament which was unanimously endorsed by the General Assembly on 20 December 1961. As I have said, to a greater or lesser degree these two preambles which we have before us do contain material from the Charter and from the joint statement of basic principles of disarmament. However, we feel that the following points should also be included in the preamble.

At the outset, we should reaffirm our dedication to the basic principles and obligations of the Charter of the United Nations. Secondly, we should state our firm resolution, in the language of the Charter, to save succeeding generations

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

from the scourge of war. With particular reference to our tasks here, we should recognize the increasing need to take early action on disarmament to remove the grave dangers resulting from the armaments race and the ever-increasing destructive power of modern weapons. Thirdly, we should reaffirm, as paragraph 3 of the Preamble to the United Nations Charter states, the necessity of establishing conditions under which justice and respect for international law can be maintained. As a corollary to that requirement and in conformity with Articles 1 to 3 of the Charter, we should also emphasize the obligation to settle international disputes by peaceful means and the need to develop friendly relations between nations in accordance with the principles of equality, self-determination and international co-operation. We should give recognition, as does the Preamble to the Charter, to the need to promote social progress and better standards of life throughout the world. We should note further how greatly the reallocation of resources now applied to armaments production could accelerate this process. Finally, we should make a clear statement of our goal as stated in paragraph 2 of the agreed principles, which is to ensure that disarmament will be general and complete and that reliable procedures for maintaining peace in accordance with the United Nations Charter will be developed as disarmament progresses.

Those are the ideas which my delegation would hope to see included in the preamble to a disarmament treaty. We would be happy to hear the suggestions of other delegations and to examine them in detail. In this connexion, we of course would have no objection to the proposal that the views which other delegations may have should be submitted in writing to, and co-ordinated by, the Secretariat. However, we feel that some of the suggestions as to the content of the preamble should be further discussed in our plenary meetings so that every member could express his views while knowing the views of all the other members. It should not be necessary to have many meetings in order to accomplish that.

When the content of the preamble is agreed, the task of drafting the precise language could be passed on to a sub-committee, which could be set up for this purpose and could include one or two other representatives in addition to those nominated by the co-Chairmen. However, if a drafting sub-committee is to be effective, it must be kept small.

We think that this procedure would result in proper consideration and in the production, so far as it lies within our capabilities, of language for a preamble which would be appropriate for the document which we hope to produce.



(Mr. Burns, Canada)

We believe that this procedure should not delay the general work and progress of the plenary Committee in considering the more substantive questions of general and complete disarmament. While work is progressing on the preamble in the manner in which I have indicated, this Committee could turn its attention to other subjects, such as those which were indicated earlier by our United States colleague or such as the Committee might agree to take up next.

The only further remark that I wish to make at this time is that when the drafting sub-committee has completed its work, the plenary Committee should of course, examine and pass upon what has been produced.

I hope that these suggestions for dealing with this matter will commend themselves to the Committee.

Mr. HAJEK (Czechoslovakia): I should like to make certain observations on the debate that has taken place this morning.

My delegation understands that at the end of the general discussion which took place during the first fortnight of our meetings we all agreed on a certain method of procedure, and this agreement is embodied in document ENDC/12. In accordance with this method of procedure, the Committee must "pursue, without delay, its primary objective of reaching agreement on general and complete disarmament". The document then states: "The Committee will consider the Soviet draft treaty on general and complete disarmament of 15 March 1962, the United States programme for general and complete disarmament of 25 September 1961, and other proposals which have been or may subsequently be made ...".

It was our understanding that by following this method we would proceed in an organized and systematic manner to the discussion of the concrete and separate provisions of the treaty to be drafted, section by section, stage by stage and point by point.

Therefore we welcomed at our last meeting the Soviet delegation's proposal to proceed immediately to a discussion of the first part of such a treaty, that is, the preamble. Of course every one of us is aware of the fact that to draft this preamble is a very important task towards which we all have to proceed with a full sense of responsibility.

The intervention by our United States colleague has raised certain doubts in the mind of my delegation. Of course we will study his intervention very carefully and we will comment on the various points, but I would say that it is a question of approach, of method. It seems to us that what the United States

(Mr. Hajek, Czechoslovakia)

delegation is proposing runs the risk of getting us once more into the general debate stage, that is to say, into a stage of confrontation of basic principles, of global views, even if we do not take the different provisions section by section but deal with it in quite another manner. I am wondering whether, if we followed this procedure which the United States delegation has suggested this morning, it would not in a certain way disorganize our discussions. We have already set forth certain proposals which are quite necessary if we are to proceed in a systematic and organized way.

Of course, I think that nobody in this Committee is in favour of a unilateral debate on this question, that is, discussing this problem on the basis of one document only, but we are all agreed that we have before us one complete, comprehensive document. The United States has also accepted, I would say, the fact that the draft treaty presented by the delegation of the Soviet Union is the most comprehensive one. I think it accepted that by promising us that it would elaborate its views and present them in a more comprehensive form. So far we have before us the draft treaty submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union, which helps us to get a basis for a systematic procedure for our discussions.

With regard to the questions raised in the intervention by the representative of the United States, of course there are many points which have to be studied, but my delegation is of the opinion that we have reached a stage where these points should not be considered and discussed in a global way but should be considered and discussed in connexion with the different stages set out in the most comprehensive draft before us.

My delegation feels -- and I think that on this we are in agreement with many other delegations here -- that we have not too much time to lose. To go back to a global discussion would certainly risk drawing us into a time-wasting procedure. Therefore we should like to suggest that at this stage of our deliberations we should not go back to a global discussion but should proceed strictly in accordance with the methods agreed on among ourselves and embodied in the document I have quoted. At this stage we have to confine the discussion to the preamble.

As Mr. Zorin has stated --- and I think this was appreciated by the United States representative -- the Soviet delegation has taken into consideration and has adopted certain observations made by the United States delegation at previous meetings. Of course some other observations have been made today by the United

(Mr. Hajek, Czechoslovakia)

States delegation and by the Canadian delegation, and it will be the business of the co-Chairmen in the first instance -- and there is a precedent for this -- to establish a procedure by which it will be possible to arrive in the shortest time at a draft to be discussed by the plenary Committee.

My delegation does not see the necessity for the time being for a special sub-committee. I think we already have established in this Committee a helpful procedure -- it lays a burden on the co-Chairmen, but I think it has been proved very useful -- that is, for the co-Chairmen to suggest the further procedure. The discussion of the preamble may take some more time; we must take into consideration all the well-founded observations. But allow me to repeat my point that we should not go back to a kind of general debate. Perhaps we could proceed to a further section of the draft and see how we can make progress in the shortest time possible.

Mr. MACOVESCU (Romania): The Romanian delegation noticed with satisfaction two days ago that our Committee had started an analysis of the draft treaty on general and complete disarmament. Now, however, we are confronted with a proposal aimed at the postponement of our debate.

My delegation feels that we are in duty bound to go on with our work on the preamble. There seems to be a large amount of agreement on the provisions of the Soviet draft. Therefore my delegation thinks it is proper to go on with our debate on the preamble. We can here and now make clear our views on the draft preamble and ought to postpone this debate only if our Committee is of the opinion that all the problems related to the preamble have not yet been clarified. Of course, we are ready to discuss any new proposals and suggestions. Only today the representative of the United States has dealt with a number of problems which are part of the draft treaty. My delegation wants to speak about first things first, and therefore address ourselves today to some problems related to the preamble.

The preamble to the draft treaty on general and complete disarmament submitted to us by the Soviet delegation is particularly important since it precisely defines the goal pursued -- the creation of a world free of weapons, free of wars -- as well as the guiding principles for the interpretation and implementation of the treaty. The ideas set forth in the preamble to the draft treaty correspond to the principles inspiring the foreign policy of our State: a policy of peace and friendship among peoples.

(Mr. Macovescu, Romania)

It is not our intention to analyse the provisions of the preamble. We would only like to emphasize some ideas included in the paragraph proclaiming:

"... the need to build relations among States on the basis of the principles of peace, good-neighbourliness, equality of States and peoples, non-interference and respect for the independence and sovereignty of all countries,". (ENDC/2)

The predominant principles of contemporary international law outline the characteristic features which proclaim and are aimed at ensuring the right of peoples to peace, security, equality and independence. The peoples were denied such rights in the past when the States had a jus ad bellum, when guns were thought of as being ultima ratio regum. We are living during a period in the history of international relations -- and the text of the preamble to which we are referring powerfully stresses this -- when the implementation of general and complete disarmament must ensure the triumph of the right of the peoples to peace, equality and independence.

The insertion of this paragraph in the preamble points to the close link between disarmament and the establishment of peaceful and friendly relations among States. The experience of international life shows that the armaments race is a powerful factor of tension in relations among States.

As long as there are weapons, there will be a danger that certain circles will use them in actions meant to worsen international relations, in interventionist actions, in actions infringing the sovereignty and independence of other States. That is why, under present circumstances, the implementation of the principles of peace and equality in rights and respect for the independence and sovereignty of all countries cannot be separated from the achievement of general and complete disarmament.

The following paragraph of the draft preamble reasserts attachment to the aims and principles of the United Nations Charter. This provision is all the more natural as the ideas set forth in the paragraph we previously referred to are fundamental principles of the Charter.

The United Nations Charter includes those rules which must lie at the basis of the joint actions of States with a view to maintaining peace and security, to developing friendly relations among nations and to achieving international co-operation. The observance of the aims and principles of the United Nations Charter, of which all members of this Committee are contracting parties, is an important prerequisite for the implementation of the treaty on general and complete disarmament.

(Mr. Macovescu, Romania)

As to the procedural question raised today by the representative of the United States, my delegation is of the opinion that we should go on with the debate on the preamble until we finish this item.

Mr. RUSSO (Italy) (translation from French): In the few words I am going to say, I shall confine myself to commenting on the preamble, mainly in order not to take up too much of your time. That does not mean that I do not attach due importance to Mr. Dean's statement. He spoke of the various problems which will arise in our work; hence, his speech was very interesting.

As regards the preamble, we have two documents before us: first, the preamble to a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control (ENDC/2), submitted by the Soviet delegation, and secondly, a programme for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world (ENDC/6) submitted by the United States delegation. My Government assisted in drafting the latter document.

During this morning's meeting Mr. Zorin agreed -- and we note his statement with satisfaction -- to introduce into the text of the preamble proposed by the Soviet Union two principles of capital importance contained in the United States programme. I should also like to mention the principle considered during the general discussion, on which the representatives of Mexico and Brazil have already spoken at length. We wish particularly to refer to this principle. The object of disarmament can only be achieved if we reaffirm the principle that relations between peoples and governments must be governed by law, and if there is an effective system of collective security which can guarantee the independence of every country and preserve peace, security and well-being.

There is another very important point -- the one raised in the McCloy-Zorin statement -- connected with the principles we should follow in drafting a treaty on general and complete disarmament. In the light of Mr. Zorin's statement and of those two principles, we believe we have now reached general agreement on the preamble, which should facilitate the next stage of our work.

There are, however, still two points in the preamble to the programme for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, submitted by the United States, to which I would like to draw your attention.

The first is the goal we should set ourselves for general and complete disarmament, namely, a world living not only in peace and security, but also in freedom, which we believe to be inseparable from real and guaranteed peace.

(Mr. Russo, Italy)

The second point is that the nations' resources should be devoted not only to material and economic progress, but also to man's spiritual development. Man is not only an economic entity; he is a much more complex being, both spiritually and culturally.

It should not be difficult to reach general agreement on those two points, which we consider extremely important.

As regards the preamble to the treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control, submitted by the Soviet Union, I have a few comments to make, which I will submit in writing later in order to state my views more precisely.

I think we should take the first paragraph of the preamble to the United Nations Charter as our first paragraph. Knowing the far-reaching disturbances which the development of nuclear weapons has caused in the world, we should mention that the range of modern weapons has revolutionized the concept of war.

I should therefore be in favour of retaining the second and third paragraphs of the preamble to the Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament submitted by the Soviet Union in the following form:

"Convinced that war cannot and must not serve as a method for settling international disputes and must forever be banished from the life of human society, in accordance with the aspirations and will of the peoples."

We would also retain the first paragraph of the preamble submitted by the Soviet Union:

"Acting in accordance with the aspirations and will of the peoples."

We should thus have emphasized that war must never serve as a means of settling disputes. We should especially stress that war "must not serve ..." as such. Experience has taught us that war has often been a means of settling problems. It is important to lay particular stress on the undertaking given not to resort to war as a means of settling international disputes. Such an affirmation will be of especial value, particularly if we can link it with the principles of international law and regard it as a general directive given to the peoples in regard to international relations.

The fifth paragraph of the Soviet preamble says:

"Desirous of putting an end to the senseless waste of human labour on the creation of the means of annihilating human beings and of destroying material values;"

(Mr. Russo, Italy)

I am in complete agreement with the substance of this paragraph -- the senseless waste of human labour; but it seems to me that this idea should be expanded, for there is not only waste of human labour, there is also waste of human resources.

In conclusion, I should like to refer to the sixth paragraph of the Soviet draft preamble:

"Seeking to direct all resources towards ensuring the further growth of welfare and socio-economic progress in all countries in the world".

I think we could usefully introduce the idea I mentioned in the first part of my statement, namely the spiritual and cultural development of man, not just his economic welfare.

As I have already said, the Italian delegation wishes to make a more detailed study of the documents put before it today, and intends to submit written proposals to contribute to the final draft of the preamble. In my opinion, this preamble is of capital importance morally, historically and politically. Each one of us must seek to make as great a contribution he possibly can, so that the preamble may really be the result of our combined efforts. I am also convinced of the importance and urgency of general agreement on the preamble. Such agreement would mark, for our Conference, the beginning of concrete and constructive work.

As regards procedure, I wish to propose here that each delegation should explain its views either orally at the meetings or in writing. In view of the complexity of the task before us, we should set as early a date as possible for the submission of our proposals to the two co-Chairmen; they can then study the proposals and put before us a text that can be adopted unanimously, as soon as possible, as the preamble to the agreement on general and complete disarmament for which we are all working.

Mr. DESAI (India): On behalf of my delegation I should like to express our pleasure at the co-operative and mutually responsive spirit displayed in the statements made by the representatives of the two co-Chairmen's countries this morning. We feel that it is important for all of us to do everything we can to maintain and further develop this particular spirit between the two co-Chairmen's countries, as that is the speediest and most effective way of securing early implementation of the tasks assigned to this Conference.

I agree with my colleague from Czechoslovakia that the debates should not be repetitive and that we should get down to business. At the same time, we feel that theoretical perfection and one hundred per cent logic are not adequate. Each of

(Mr. Desai, India)

us, in his own conceit, considers the particular draft or formulation that he may put forward to be one hundred per cent perfect. That is not the way to speedy and effective work, because the debate might again continue. What is required is to recognize the facts of life. It will be impossible to arrive at a satisfactory draft treaty on general and complete disarmament unless the draft, in its detail as well as in its general formulation, is acceptable to the big Powers and particularly to the representatives of the two co-Chairmen's countries. Having recognised this fact we should, as I mentioned earlier, do everything possible to retain and promote that mutually responsive spirit that has prevailed this morning. We entirely agree that speed is important, but mere speed which results in very little is not enough. It is better to hasten slowly and, even if we are slow, to be sure that we accomplish something.

In the light of these observations we welcome the idea that delegations should send in their suggestions in writing to the Secretariat by Tuesday morning. In a matter of this sort it would be difficult for the Secretariat to prepare a draft in the light of these various suggestions for the consideration of the Conference, because the matters involved are complicated, tricky and very often political. We therefore feel that at some stage -- perhaps on Tuesday -- it would be desirable for the Committee to adopt the suggestion of appointing a drafting sub-committee consisting of representatives of the co-Chairmen's countries plus two, three or four other members of the Committee, so that, in the light of the general discussion, the various suggestions made to the Secretariat in writing and the various ideas put forward in the debate, the sub-committee may attempt to draft a preamble which will harmonize the various viewpoints and, to the extent possible, include the various suggestions made. Such a draft prepared by the sub-committee would not have any individual parentage and would be more satisfactory generally for further discussion in plenary and final adoption. We commend this idea for the consideration of the Committee.

Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom): I would like to make one or two comments now in regard to the discussion that we have had this morning in particular in regard to the preamble to the treaty.

When he spoke the other day, Lord Home warmly welcomed the basis of the preamble. He said that he had very little, if any, quarrel with the sentiments expressed by Mr. Gromyko at that time. That, I think, has clearly been the view of practically all the representatives who have spoken in our discussion. There



(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

are some eminently laudable sentiments in this preamble, and ones which I am sure we can all welcome. But I am sure too that this preamble does deserve the closest study by us all. Indeed, it would be less than courteous to our Soviet colleagues who have submitted the preamble to us if we did not subject it to the closest and more careful scrutiny, welcoming the principles involved in it, suggesting others and, as the representative of Canada said earlier today, seeking perhaps to formalize its wording in some ways so as to give it greater clarity and, as he said, language both dignified and solemn. That, I think, is our objective.

I would like to make one or two particular comments in relation to the preamble. Firstly, our United States colleagues did propose two additions in their initial consideration of it, and I was very glad this morning to hear Mr. Zorin welcome and accept both these proposals. I think this is a very helpful step forward and is indicative of the way in which we are all trying to work together in this Committee.

I, in turn, would like to suggest another point, which I think the principles which we agreed last September emphasized in particular and which I do not think has been given quite sufficient prominence. This is the question of a United Nations peace force. It could be argued that this particular point has already been covered by the second of the United States proposals accepted by the Soviet Union this morning, but this point was thought by the co-authors of the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles to warrant the drafting of a special principle to cover it specifically, and I really feel we would do well to follow this example and to include a similar paragraph in our draft preamble.

Perhaps I might suggest a form of words. We could take up the wording of the Agreed Principles themselves and, after the paragraph which reads:

"Reaffirming their dedication to the aims and principles of the United Nations Charter" (ENDC/2, page 1), we could have a paragraph reading:

"Accepting the obligation of States to place at the disposal of the United Nations agreed manpower necessary for an international peace force to be equipped with agreed types of armaments."

These are not my words, they are the words of the Agreed Principles (ENDC/5, page 3) and I think it would be helpful if they could be included, possibly in the position I have suggested. In that context I do recall that a previous speaker this morning felt that the paragraph I have suggested to precede these words should in fact itself be raised to a more prominent position. I am not arguing about the position, merely suggesting that this paragraph should logically be close to the paragraph beginning "Reaffirming".

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

I was rather struck, too, by the suggestion made by Mr. Wachuku the other day when he spoke of an appeal for the discontinuance of hostile propaganda and subversion. Perhaps I could remind the Conference of his words. He said:

"Instead of subversion, the tendency to destroy the human spirit, emphasis should be laid on the finer elements, qualities and achievements of mankind; emphasis should not always be laid on differences and difficulties..." (ENDC/PV.10, page 61).

I think that is an excellent point, and, while I admit that the existing text contains a reference to good-neighbourliness and non-interference, I believe the final text could with advantage have some improvements on those lines.

A number of other suggestions have been put forward this morning, with most of which I find myself in agreement. I was very interested in the proposal of the representative of Italy that the fifth paragraph should be expanded. I entirely agree with him on that. I had been thinking very much on the same lines, and in seeking to see how it could be expanded I looked at the draft preamble to the United States plan submitted last September. The preamble there contains some very fine and very well expressed sentiments, and I would like to take out certain words from the third paragraph of that preamble and insert them in the fifth paragraph of the Soviet draft. If we are to marry the two, this seems to be one of the ways in which this could be done.

In regard to the words "Desirous of putting an end to the senseless waste of human labour on the creation of the means of annihilating human beings and of destroying material values", I would make one comment. I am not too keen about the words "destroying material values". Possibly in other languages it has a different connotation but to me it seems a rather clumsy phrase in English; while I am sure in Russian it has a perfect flow, in English it does not have quite that same evenness. I would like to give that some thought. I have not any immediate suggestions as to how I would re-phrase "destroying material values", but provisionally I would suggest, after the words "annihilating human beings", the words "and material destruction," or something like that.

Then I would take in the words from the third paragraph of the United States preamble, with one or two words to lead in. I would go on like this: "and of establishing conditions where the resources of nations shall be devoted to man's material, cultural and spiritual advance". That, I think, does meet the point which the representative of Italy put forward, and I would suggest that as one way of seeking to meet his proposal, with which I entirely agree. I think it could be said that it overlaps a little the succeeding paragraph but it is not quite the same point and I think it wants spelling out.

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

I would like to study further some of the other suggestions that have been put forward. I have several other drafting points myself. I am not too sure, in the paragraph which begins "Proceedings", whether the word "fact" is the appropriate word. We all hope that it will be a fact, but at this moment of time it is not a fact. If one is to be strict, one should say "the belief that general and complete disarmament ...". It is a passionate belief, a very real belief held by us all, but it cannot as yet, at this moment of time, be said to be a fact. That may be said to be a pedantic comment, but I think if we are seeking to finalize a form of words in what is, as the representative of Canada said, an extremely important document, we must be sure that the wordings that we get are adequate and lasting and of a quality and pattern that justify the importance of the document.

In addition I have several other minor points which I do not think it necessary to weary the Conference with this morning, but I welcome the suggestion of a drafting sub-committee that has been put forward, and supported, I think, by several representatives, including the representative of India. The representative of India talked of the two co-Chairmen plus two, three or four other members. I entirely agree that a drafting sub-committee must be small to be effective. Quite clearly, seeking to draft round this table is difficult and, indeed, inappropriate. All we can do is to put forward suggestions and to ask a drafting sub-committee to consider and propose to us at a later stage what the final draft should be.

In that connexion, I think it is clear that, while it is very important that we should clarify the position and get a provisional preamble established, it would be quite improper, in my view, to finalize the wording of the preamble right at the early stages of our work. We may find as our work develops that there are one or two other principles which we would wish to lay emphasis on in the preamble, and so, while I entirely agree that we should get a drafting sub-committee going as soon as possible and that we should get a draft provisional preamble approved by the plenary body as soon as possible, we should still retain the right, if the plenary so decides, at a later stage to make certain drafting amendments to it to take account of our subsequent discussions. I think that is essential and I think it is right to make the point now.

So far as the preamble is concerned, I believe we all of us have thought very carefully about the words that have been put forward. We are all grateful to the Soviet Union for submitting a draft for us to discuss. I am sure it has been helpful and that we shall want the drafting sub-committee to consider the proposals already

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

put before us and additional proposals which, as I think the representative of Italy suggested, we should all submit in writing. This will give us time to give still further thought. I agree that these proposals should be sent in within the next few days. One could put a time-limit on it. Certainly we do not want the thing to drag on. But I think it would be right that we should have the opportunity to make further suggestions in writing in this way. Therefore I endorse largely what has been said so far today in regard to the preamble.

I should just like to make one or two remarks in regard to some of the very important comments that were made by the United States representative. I observe that one subsequent speaker felt that this was somewhat broadening the discussion. However, I think that when we are considering the preamble it is right that we should also be considering some of the essential points in regard to the treaty itself. I thought the suggestions which came from Mr. Dean were most interesting and deserving of our close study. He mentioned in particular four areas which he thought were particularly important. He spoke of the reduction and the elimination of nuclear weapons. He spoke of the elimination of all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction. He talked of the establishment of the international disarmament organization. He spoke of the institution and the maintenance of peace and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means. These are four key matters in relation to a treaty and obviously they should be reflected in the preamble. Therefore, it is not inappropriate that we should give them at least some consideration at this particular time.

I think the proposals that have been put before the Conference in relation to the reduction and the elimination of nuclear weapons are valuable ones. We have had proposals from the Soviet Union, we have had proposals from the United States and I hope we shall very soon be getting down to discussing and considering how we are to proceed to the elimination of these weapons, and how we are to proceed to the elimination of the means of delivery of these weapons.

These are some of the first substantive matters that I think we have to discuss. It is abundantly clear that on all sides there is the urgent feeling that these are among the first things which we must settle, because it is around these that everything else revolves. And, clearly, the elimination of the means of delivery of these weapons of mass destruction is of prime importance. We have the proposal put forward by Mr. Rusk of a 30 per cent reduction in the first stage. We have a bolder proposal from the Soviet Union. These we have got to discuss in detail. While we have got to press forward just as fast as possible, I thought the

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

proposals of Mr. Rusk were realistic in the extreme. Possibly they could be speeded up a bit -- I do not know; this is a matter for careful consideration -- but it is no good seeking to go faster than we are able to do in this enormously complicated, complex subject, one in which the security of States is so very much bound up.

As regards the international disarmament organization, I do hope we are soon going to be able to give very serious and careful thought to this, because it is the body which is going to provide the machinery by which all the work which we do in this Conference is going to be carried out. It is very important that we do get a soundly based organization, and in that regard I think that the proposals which appear in the United States draft plan are extremely helpful and extremely illuminating. Whether this is a matter on which we would wish at some time to set up a sub-committee I do not know -- I am quite prepared to go along with the views of the Conference in regard to this -- but what I am certain of is that, in whatever body it is discussed, this is a matter to which we should all be giving a great deal of thought at the present time. I am not sure whether there ought not to be some more specific reference to it in the preamble. I think that is something which we ought to think about.

Then as regards the strengthening of institutions for the maintenance of peace and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means -- which was Mr. Dean's fourth point -- I have already referred to that in regard to the preamble. My feeling is that we have got to clarify our intentions there considerably. A great deal of thought has got to go into this, because while the international disarmament organization will be the machinery by which we carry out our decisions, the ultimate success of our work is going to depend very much on the way in which this fourth principle is carried into effect. We must have confidence that while the nations of the world do disarm there will be this adequate measure of settling disputes by peaceful means, and that there will be behind it the United Nations peace force, which will be adequately and effectively staffed and which will be there as an effective deterrent against any attempt at aggression at any stage, from any State in the world. After all, this will be the security, the only security, of every national State; thus, tremendous importance devolves upon that. I hope, for that reason, that the suggestion I have made for the further insertion in the preamble will commend itself to the Conference and to the sponsors of this particular preamble.

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

On a smaller point, I was interested in what Mr. Dean said at one stage in regard to the question of fissionable material. I noticed that he mentioned the possibility of setting up an expert study group on the feasibility and means for accomplishing the verified reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons and the halting of production of fissionable material for weapon purposes. This I would certainly support. It seems to me to be a valuable suggestion and one which could be of real help to the work of this Conference on this highly complicated subject. I would say here that we in the United Kingdom have had this problem under investigation for a considerable period of time, and we would be very interested in making our results available to the Conference and in working with an expert committee in this regard. We believe that this is a helpful move; it is one in which we would willingly play our full part if it were the wish of the Conference.

I do not think there are any further points I wish to make at this stage. I hope that we shall be able to set up a drafting sub-committee. I hope that that sub-committee will be able to take full account of the things that are being said here this morning and that we shall have the opportunity, in a very limited period of time -- in the next few days perhaps -- of submitting to that sub-committee further suggestions and proposals in regard to the actual words of the preamble, so that it may then set about the work either of actually working on this text or of proposing different paragraphs to take the place of certain of these paragraphs. Very careful work is, I think, required. I do not think it need take a great deal of time, but I do think it needs a small body, an effective body, if we are to get a final draft of this preamble of which we can all be proud and which will help to direct us in the very important work that lies ahead.

Mr. LOUCANOV (Bulgaria) (translation from Russian): I should like to begin by expressing my delegation's great satisfaction at the fact that our Committee has at last, at the beginning of the third week of its work, got down to the practical business of examining the future draft treaty on general and complete disarmament. The representatives of the Press will obviously give the world this welcome news without delay. We are already engaged on discussing the future draft treaty and have considered its preamble.

At the last meeting of the Committee our delegation made a proposal which, as far as I remember, Secretary of State Rusk accepted orally shortly after we spoke. I wish to repeat this proposal. We proposed that the two co-Chairmen should consider all the views expressed on the preamble and any wishes which have been or may be put forward by delegations and should submit a final agreed draft preamble which the Committee would then approve.

(Mr. Loucanov, Bulgaria)

An addition was made to this proposal, to the best of my recollection, by Mr. Rusk. It was that delegations should hand in to the Secretariat in writing their observations and proposals for additions. We still think that this would be the most rapid procedure. The smallest and consequently, from a practical point of view, the most effective drafting committee would consist of our two co-Chairmen. We are all free to submit for their consideration our wishes, critical observations and proposals for additions, whether they relate to form or to substance. This procedure would enable us to reach a speedy decision on this initial question.

I also think that, as the Soviet draft treaty and the programme submitted by the United States delegation were circulated to delegations at the outset of our work, a sufficient period has since elapsed; discussion has also taken place in this Committee. We could therefore reduce the period for submitting this material and set a deadline of, say, tomorrow or Monday. This would mean that, as the United States delegation has suggested today, we would have the draft submitted to us by the two co-Chairmen on Tuesday at the very latest.

I should like to remind you, gentlemen, that we are not concerned with drafting the preamble of the Charter of the United Nations or of any other international body which would be called upon to establish peace. We are concerned here with drafting simpler and, I might say, more precise provisions that must be in keeping with the basic document we are considering.

What are the facts? Already at the time of its foundation the United Nations came to the conclusion that mankind must be saved from the scourge of war and that succeeding generations must be spared war and the sufferings it causes. Though not very quickly perhaps and not without difficulty, the United Nations eventually reached the conclusion that, to avoid war, it is necessary to undertake general and complete disarmament and that there is no possible alternative. There can be no partial disarmament or deals of any kind. The Minister of Defence of India, Mr. Menon, made this point very well in this Committee on 20 March, when he said, if I remember correctly, that two or three years ago the United Nations was concerned with partial measures, but that it ultimately came to the conclusion that only general and complete disarmament can save mankind from war (ENDC/PV.5, page 23).

The United Nations also came to the conclusion that the resources now being spent on military preparations and armaments should be used for the benefit of mankind, for raising the peoples' standard of living. It further came to the conclusion that only when general and complete disarmament has been implemented, that is, when lasting peace has been established on earth, can the basic objective

(Mr. Loucanov, Bulgaria)

of the United Nations Charter be fully attained, namely, that all peoples and States should live together as good neighbours, competing in the peaceful field of labour, enjoying the benefits of material and spiritual progress, developing their own national cultures and refraining from interference in each other's affairs.

All the principles I have just mentioned are contained in the Soviet draft preamble and have a precise bearing on the draft treaty on general and complete disarmament, but on no other treaty.

I am not sure -- perhaps the interpretation was inaccurate -- but it seems to me that in Mr. Dean's statement today I heard words to the effect that disarmament is not in itself the goal. Well, outside the walls of this Conference room one can perhaps express such a view. No doubt it can be argued whether disarmament is the primary objective of mankind or not, but outside this Conference room. In this Conference room we can only discuss disarmament because it is for this purpose that we are gathered here. What sort of a preamble are we in fact adopting? One concerned with the organization of peace now and in the future? Are we called upon to make recommendations to States regarding their social systems or any other matters? We are not called upon to deal with such complicated issues. Are we required to settle ideological disputes? Such questions, too, are not our concern.

We have been given one very strictly defined task, that of submitting a treaty on general and complete disarmament to the United Nations, and the preamble of the treaty should be in keeping with this task. It is, therefore, our personal opinion that the question is not of such complexity or momentous significance that days and weeks are needed for its discussion. We could submit our observations very quickly to a small drafting committee composed of our two co-Chairmen. On Monday, or at the very latest on Tuesday, as the United States delegation has suggested, we could discuss and adopt an agreed text of the preamble to our basic draft treaty.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian)  
We have listened very carefully to the comments and statements which have been made today concerning the preamble to the treaty.

I can also express my satisfaction at the fact that the Committee has begun a thoroughly concrete study of the document which we have to prepare. The proposals which have been submitted on this subject deserve, of course, attention and



(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

I am bound to say that many of the considerations put forward by various delegations deserve to be included in the text proposed by us as additions or amendments. We shall certainly include those proposals. On the other hand, a number of considerations advanced by some of the representatives create an impression of what I might call artificiality. When one takes a close look at those suggestions and at the questions it is proposed to mention in the preamble, one finds that as a matter of fact all these questions are already dealt with in the preamble.

I do not want to speak today of all the considerations that have been put forward, but I should like to draw attention to five additions mentioned today by the representative of Canada. He said that the whole preamble should be based on two main sources, the United Nations Charter and the Statement of Agreed Principles. I think that this is the right approach, and I am sure that all the delegations, after having studied our draft preamble with care, can say that the preamble is in fact based on these two fundamental documents. That is perfectly true.

Further, the representative of Canada mentioned additional points which should be included in the preamble. In particular, he said that, first of all, it was essential to reflect the desire of the peoples to avoid the scourge of war, in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

When we look at the third paragraph of our preamble, we see that it reads: "Fulfilling the historic mission of saving all the nations from the horrors of war." That is exactly the same idea as that expressed in the Charter and advocated by the representative of Canada.

He also spoke of the conditions of a just settlement of various problems by peaceful means and referred to the Charter in that connexion. I see here the paragraph which we inserted at the suggestion of Mr. Rusk, to the effect that general and complete disarmament shall be accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

The representative of Canada also referred to the promotion of social progress and better standards of life. Incidentally, the representative of the United States has drawn attention here to the paragraph of our preamble which reads as follows: "Seeking to direct all resources towards ensuring the further growth of welfare and socio-economic progress in all the countries of the world". I note, by the way, that Mr. Dean expressed some doubts about the wording "socio-economic progress". As I understood his remark in the interpretation, it seems to him that this concept is not quite clearly worded or that he does not quite know what we have in mind.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

I wish to explain, in connexion with the remarks made by the representatives of Canada and the United States, that we have in mind the part of the preamble to the United Nations Charter which refers to the need "to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples". We took over this formula and simply wrote "welfare and socio-economic progress in all countries of the world". If Mr. Godber, who I think also commented on this point, considers that it would be better to begin with economic progress and then to refer to social progress, I do not think that would give rise to any objection. Of course, the paragraph can be worded in that way. But I feel obliged to point out, and I wish to do so in connexion with a whole series of comments, that one can go on for ever improving the wording of any document. If we wished to do so, we could sit here a whole year formulating and improving the wording of any document. I even think we could sit here for several years, but I do not believe that this is our task. What is important is that we should express the main substance of the matter in the preamble and determine the direction to be taken in subsequent articles of the document. That is why we have tried to be as concise as possible and as close as possible to the already accepted formulae of the United Nations Charter, the Statement of Agreed Principles or other international documents, in formulating the basic propositions which actually define our approach to the document we are preparing. In this connexion, the representative of Bulgaria, Mr. Loucanov, was quite right to stress that it is not our task to draft a document which would cover all the problems of establishing peace on earth and co-operation among all peoples. The United Nations Charter exists for that purpose; it is not being replaced by this document. Starting out from that Charter and basing ourselves on its main provisions, we are considering a specific problem, the problem of disarmament. And it is in the light of this task that we have tried to draft a preamble to the document.

I now return to what I said about the remarks of the representative of Canada, and should like to point out that the social advancement, promotion of social progress and better standards of life to which he referred are included in the text which we propose.

Finally, the representative of Canada spoke about reliable procedures for ensuring general and complete disarmament. I have already referred to the text which we have added, which clearly mentions the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and effective measures for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

Those were the remarks made by the representative of Canada in connexion with his desire that the basic ideas of the Charter and of the Statement of Agreed Principles should be reflected in this document. But as you see, it seems perfectly clear to me that the basic propositions to which he referred are reflected in this document. I repeat that, of course, anyone can express these ideas in his own way. If all the seventeen members were to propose their own wording, the wording used by each member of our Committee would naturally differ somewhat from that of the others. Nevertheless, we have set ourselves the task of creating a single treaty, acceptable to all and based on the fundamental provisions of the Charter and the Statement of Agreed Principles, as is stated in the first item of our procedure of work. I believe that the draft which we have submitted corresponds, on the whole, to this task. Does this mean that it cannot be improved? Of course it can. But then, again, the draft might be made worse. This is also possible, since not all the proposals submitted necessarily improve the draft. It might be made worse through the introduction of elements which do not essentially relate to the matter or which should be reflected in other parts of the document. In particular, I should like to mention in this connexion the remark made by the representative of the United Kingdom, suggesting that the armed forces of the United Nations which are to maintain peace in a disarmed world should be mentioned in the preamble itself. I do not know why the representative of the United Kingdom should now wish to include a reference to armed forces right in the preamble to a document on disarmament. I think that this is hardly in keeping with the basic purpose of the document. I do not mean that this question should not be reflected anywhere in the document. Naturally, in the relevant part where reference will be made to the machinery for the maintenance of peace, there will be a paragraph on the appropriate police and militia forces which are to maintain order and help towards achieving the settlement of disputes in case of need, in accordance with United Nations procedure. As you know, such provisions have been included in the draft which we have submitted for your consideration. But to include this in the preamble would be putting the cart before the horse and, I should say, would give the whole document and the whole preamble a somewhat incorrect trend. The preamble should refer primarily to the task of disarmament, and not to armed forces. This seems perfectly obvious to me. If we begin to speak of armed forces in the preamble to a document on disarmament, the world will not understand us. In any case, the peoples will be surprised and will ask why we begin to speak of armed forces in a document on disarmament, and in the preamble itself.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

I think that we can have further discussions on this question, but it seems to me that this proposal would make the draft worse, instead of improving it.

On the other hand, certain other proposals submitted by the representative of the United Kingdom and also by the representatives of Italy and of some other countries who have spoken here are worth considering and I think that it might be possible to adopt some of these proposals. In particular, the representative of the United Kingdom referred to the paragraph reading "seeking to direct all resources towards ensuring the further growth of welfare, and socio-economic progress in all countries in the world" and proposed to add from the United States draft preamble the phrase "the resources of nations shall be devoted to man's material, cultural and spiritual advance". I think that the same proposal was submitted by the representative of Italy, and it was also mentioned by the representative of the United States. I think that this is acceptable. It gives a somewhat more concrete form to the basic idea set forth in the draft. Accordingly, we could amend the paragraph to read:

"Seeking to direct all resources towards ensuring the further growth of welfare, and social and economic progress in all countries of the world, so that the resources of nations shall be devoted to man's material, cultural and spiritual advance".

I think that this may be acceptable.

I shall not deal with a number of other remarks, some of which can be adopted in one form or another but some of which seem to be superfluous. All this requires careful study. For this reason, it seems to me that we should conclude our discussion of the preamble and try to find a text which would include the main propositions put forward, would promote the purposes of the document, would be in conformity with the United Nations Charter and with the Agreed Statement of Principles and might improve the wording.

I fully agree with the representative of Bulgaria that we should not drag out this process. One might gather from the statements of certain delegations that some of them are prepared to work on the preamble for many more weeks. I do not think that this is the right approach. It is quite uncalled for by the requirements of the matter. No delegation has stated that it disagrees in principle with the preamble; all delegations have said that, on the whole, they agree with the basic ideas of the preamble. If that is so, we should not waste too much time on drafting work which would prolong the process of preparing the treaty which we need and which, according to the decision of the General Assembly, we must

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

submit to the United Nations Disarmament Commission by 1 June. I think that we should speed up our work. This does not mean that we should scamp it; it is perfectly true that we must do good work. But I repeat that drafting work, as anyone who has taken part in that sort of work is well aware, is such that one can go on for ever improving, altering and amending any text.

I think that we shall be able to finish preparing this draft in a few days and to submit it for a first reading. In this connexion, I agree with the representative of the United Kingdom that for the time being we are not adopting the document as a whole and that it is therefore natural that we should have a first draft of the preamble, but one that has already been agreed upon basically. When we complete the whole document, some additional ideas may arise in respect of the preamble also. But I know from work in other bodies that when a preamble has been agreed upon, it is usually not reviewed again, and if there is such a review, it takes place in the very final stage of drafting, before the signature of the document or its submission to the States concerned for signature and ratification.

I would therefore propose, if my United States colleague agrees, since we are the main authors of the documents -- our own and that of the United States respectively -- that we should try to complete the drafting of this document as rapidly as possible, taking into account the remarks made by a number of delegations and those which may be submitted to us in writing through the Secretariat. I think that this is the simplest and most business-like way of settling the matter and I think that this can be done in the next few days.

Bearing in mind that these documents have already been before the Committee for a considerable time, I do not think there should be any great difficulty in submitting suggestions to us by tomorrow, so that we could present the final text, say, on Monday. Of course, we shall have to sacrifice part of our weekend, but I think that this can be done in such a good cause. Then on Monday we could meet to consider the final text of the draft preamble on first reading.

If the representative of the United States considers that this does not leave us enough time for our final work, I would agree, let us say, that all the final amendments and proposals should be submitted in writing not later than 10 o'clock on Monday morning, so that we can present the final text on Tuesday. I think that such a method of work is practical and will undoubtedly make a good impression on public opinion, which will see that we are not creeping along like tortoises, but are following a normal procedure in a business-like way, and are preparing, section by section, the draft of the document submitted for our consideration.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

With regard to the remarks made by the representative of the United States on a number of questions dealt with further on in the document, we shall, of course, study all these considerations and give replies to all the questions when dealing with the relevant parts of the treaty and the relevant parts of the stages of the treaty in the course of our subsequent deliberations.

I should like to make myself clear: the representative of the United States referred, for example, to a number of questions relating to the second stage of disarmament, others relating to the first stage of disarmament and others again relating to the last stage of disarmament. Of course, it would hardly be correct to discuss these questions in a confused manner; it would be better to consider them in the proper order. When, for instance, we come to the second stage, let us consider the questions relating to that second stage. We are prepared to examine carefully all the considerations expressed here by various delegations.

I should, however, like to point out that the remark made by the representative of the United States to the effect that he had some doubts about our draft treaty, in that it provides for some unverifiable obligations, for instance, those relating to the elimination of chemical and bacteriological weapons and the cessation of production of fissionable materials, is clearly based on a misunderstanding. We have no intention of introducing any unverifiable obligations into the treaty. We intend any measure of disarmament in the treaty to be a verifiable measure. I am making this general comment in order to eliminate misunderstandings in the future. On specific questions we shall, of course, have more to say later when we deal with the relevant parts of the document. Those are the considerations I thought it necessary to put forward. Our attitude is based on the spirit of co-operation, we have met many of the wishes expressed here and we have already accepted a number of amendments proposed by the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and Italy. We are prepared to examine any other amendments which may be submitted and we hope that, with the help of the United States as co-Chairman, we shall be able to submit by Tuesday morning an agreed draft preamble for adoption, so to speak, on first reading.

Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom): I should like to comment very briefly on the interesting remarks to which we have just listened from the representative of the Soviet Union. I am grateful to him for the ready agreement which he has shown to some of the suggestions that I put forward.

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

One point of correction: I would merely say that he suggested that I had proposed an addition in the paragraph beginning with the word "Seeking" (ENDC/2). I had actually suggested this addition in regard to the previous paragraph beginning with the word "Desirous". But I would be quite happy for the addition to be made to whichever paragraph is most appropriate. I am merely making it clear that that was in fact my proposition.

I should like to bring up another small point. Mr. Zorin referred to this word "socio-economic". In doing so he mentioned my name. Actually I had not referred to this at all; I believe it was my United States colleague who referred to it. But I would say in this regard that I find it as repellent as it must be to others. Since he has called my attention to it, I would say that I would certainly welcome the use of the words "social and economic". I do not like marrying these two words in this particular way. I hope that he will agree to that very small amendment. Indeed, in that regard he told us that this was taken straight from the Charter. I was reading the Charter at the time. I do not think he made it quite clear to us that in fact the Charter reads, "to promote social progress" -- it does not mention "economic progress". In fact, I am very happy to include the word "economic". But I think that it is important, when we are claiming parentage, that we should have our parentage absolutely right.

On the point where he appeared to be rejecting my proposal for the inclusion of a reference to a peace force, I was less happy. Quite frankly I found that his answer -- if he will forgive me for saying so -- lacked logic, which is unusual for Mr. Zorin. It seemed to me that he said in the beginning of his remarks that he agreed entirely with the representative of Canada that the preamble should be based both on the Charter and on the Agreed Principles. I should like to remind him that paragraph 2 of the Agreed Principles lays particular emphasis on this, using the very words I mentioned. He said that a reference to "force" might make people misunderstand what we were seeking to do. I would have thought that an international peace force would be the most harmless of all forces, and indeed the one which is required to give that element of confidence which is essential if our work in national disarmament is to succeed. Let there be no question about this: if we are all to throw away all our armaments, then there must be set up, at some stage -- I do not say in the initial stage -- this effective international peace force. I would have thought that would add a point to the document. I do not press it. I do not wish to make this a big point. But I was a little disturbed -- disappointed perhaps --

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

at the fact that Mr. Zorin sought to reject this out of hand. I would beg him to consider this again because I do think, for the reasons which I have stated, that there is merit in its inclusion.

I have one last point. I understood Mr. Zorin to say in his closing remarks that he favoured the idea that the Soviet Union and the United States, as co-Chairmen, should consider the draft. From this I took it that he was not in favour of a drafting sub-committee. If that is so, I can only say I am sorry because I think it would have been preferable for one or two other States around his table to join with the two co-Chairmen in this particularly responsible job. However, if the two co-Chairmen between them are able to produce an effective and agreed draft, certainly I would not stand in the way. I would merely say that I would have thought, both from the point of view of expedition of the work and of making all the States here feel that they were fully connected and fully engaged in this important task, there would be advantage in bringing one or two other representatives into the drafting work.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I have been very much impressed by the co-operative attitude of the representative of the Soviet Union, as indeed I was last summer when we were working together on the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles. As far as we are concerned, either procedure for submitting the draft preamble to the plenary Committee is quite acceptable to us. If it seems better that the two co-Chairmen do this work, we are quite agreeable to that.

I must say that I was impressed by the remarks of the representatives of Canada, India, Italy, the United Kingdom, and I believe others, as to the advisability of having one or two, or more, representatives from other countries participate in the drafting. But either method of procedure is quite agreeable to us.

I do hope that, since he has shown such clear evidence this morning of his great ability to agree, Mr. Zorin will agree to allow representatives to have until 10 a.m. Tuesday to submit their suggestions. We will certainly work long and hard with our Soviet colleagues to get a draft of the preamble before the Committee at the earliest possible date -- and if we agree to the deadline of 10 a.m. Tuesday I would hope we could submit it on Wednesday. But I would prefer that we did not set a deadline. I would think we might get it in by Wednesday, but if we wanted to have another twenty-four hours to reconsider it, I think that might be preferable. But, as far as we are concerned, I am sure from our former experience with our Soviet colleague that we will be able to work this thing out and bring a draft back for the consideration of the full Committee.



Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian):

I do not wish to delay the members of the Committee, because lunch-time is approaching; but I want to make two remarks about the most recent statements.

To begin with, about the statement by the United Kingdom representative. I made some remarks on the addition in fact proposed by the United States representative. That is so. But when I started making my statement, I heard you also make some remark aloud during my statement, by which you seemed to me to be supporting my remarks. That is perhaps why I made a mistake and referred to the United Kingdom representative. I am very glad that this has now been cleared up. But I must say that what I was speaking on seems after all to have some reference to you, because you also have presented your ideas on this addition about economic and social advancement. But I do not know why -- at least that is how I heard it in the interpretation -- you said that the Charter makes no mention of "economic advancement" but only of "social advancement". I do not know -- possibly the Russian text differs from the English -- but in the last part of the preamble, before the words "have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims" it says:

"... for the promotion of the economic and social advancement..."

I think you have this also in English. I cannot imagine that the Russian text differs from the English. It therefore seems to me that, as far as I can see, we are in complete agreement on this point. I believe that this is so.

With regard to the United Nations peace force, I stand by what I have been saying earlier. I fully agree with what is stated in point 7 of the Agreed Principles. This point does in fact refer to forces for the maintenance of peace, and I am not opposed to that in substance. The Principles, as we all know, have been agreed with the Soviet Government. The Soviet Government has signed the Principles. You will find in our draft Treaty a special section dealing with international forces. But to include this in the preamble -- that is where I believe we and you differ. To have this in the preamble is, I think, quite inadvisable, because it may convey an entirely wrong idea of the document itself. We speak of disarmament, and yet in the preamble we include a provision about armed forces. To my mind, this is inappropriate from the point of view of political principle. But that difference of opinion I shall try to discuss further with my co-Chairman and, I believe, we shall find a favourable solution.

My last remark is about the time limit for the submission of observations and of amendments to the draft preamble. From the first statement by the United States representative I understood him to say that he was still in favour of some

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

time limit for the submission of all amendments. He proposed, I believe, Tuesday morning. I propose that this time limit should be set one day earlier. I think perhaps this will prove acceptable.

As for the date on which we may be able to present the final draft, I think perhaps we had better not set any time limit just yet; but there should be a time limit for all the delegations to submit their amendments, and it seems to me that we might agree to 10 a.m. on Monday. After that we will get down to all the amendments and try to present a draft by Tuesday -- or, if we meet with difficulties, perhaps the next day. But I should like it to be decided that the time limit for submitting amendments is 10 a.m. on Monday. I think this is quite acceptable to all, since it appears from the various statements that all the delegates have their definite points of view, and they can of course formulate these before Monday.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I am very happy to hear what the representative of the Soviet Union has just said. If it is agreeable to all the other representatives, the time limit of 10 a.m. next Monday for the submission of suggestions or alterations with regard to the preamble will be quite acceptable to us. I mentioned Tuesday merely because that would give representatives an opportunity of consulting with their governments, but if 10 a.m. on Monday is generally agreeable that will be quite acceptable to us. Although I promised Mr. Zorin that we would work hard with him in order to prepare the preamble, I think it might be wise not to set a precise time limit for the submission of the preamble.

The CHAIRMAN (Sweden): If there are no other speakers we could now perhaps consider the suggestions which have been made during our proceedings this morning.

First of all, in relation to the first matter of the preamble, a recommendation, widely supported, has been made that the oral amendments we have heard and any further amendments which delegations might wish to make should be submitted in writing, and the two co-Chairmen have informed us that they would like to have this material sent to the Secretariat by 10 a.m. next Monday. Would that be agreeable to the Conference?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (Sweden): As to the preparation of a joint draft, the two co-Chairmen have agreed that they themselves should undertake this work. I understand, too, that they might consider the question, which has also been raised here, of forming a sub-committee, should they find need for some help at any stage.

Several other matters relating to the substance of the treaty have also been touched upon this morning, and it is my understanding that the Conference will wish to discuss these at a later meeting. In that connexion I think that the question raised by Mr. Dean of sub-committees on specific points might come back to us for further discussion.

The one point on which we need clarity immediately, I think, is the date of our next meeting, and I wonder whether the co-Chairmen could give us the benefit of their advice on this now. For one thing, I have to include it in the communique.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): We are prepared to meet tomorrow, if the United States representative has no objection.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): That would be quite agreeable to us.

The CHAIRMAN (Sweden): The two co-Chairmen have agreed to advise us that we should have a plenary meeting tomorrow at 10.00 a.m.

The Conference decided to issue the following communique:

"The Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its eleventh meeting at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of Mrs. Myrdal, Ambassador and representative of Sweden.

"The representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Italy, India, the United Kingdom and Bulgaria made statements.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Friday, 30 March 1962, at 10.00 a.m."

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

